

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 13, 18, 25, 30, 32, 49 and 55 have been amended without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter ha been added.

Claims 1-55 remain in the application.

(Detailed Action item 2)

Claims 1-10, 12, 18-24, 25-29 and 30-31 were rejected under 35USC§101

Applicant has amended independent claims, 1, 13, 18, 25 and 30. No new matter has been added. These independent claims now clarify that the system includes a computer display for displaying components. Support for this amendment is found at least in FIGs. 20 and 21 and the corresponding description beginning in paragraph [0139].
Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35USC§101 now be withdrawn.

(Detailed Action item 3)

Claims 1-55 were rejected under 35USC§112, second paragraph

Claims 1, 13, 18, 30, 32 and 49 and 55 have been amended to overcome the ambiguities and remove indefiniteness noted by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35USC§112, second paragraph now be withdrawn.

(Detailed Action item 4)

Claims 1-55 were rejected under 35USC§102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,096,173.

Applicant has provided a Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 along with a Terminal

Disclaimer to overcome the rejection. The Declaration is signed by inventor Roger Skidmore. Inventor Theodore Rappaport is no longer with the company and as such no signature has been obtained.

(Detailed Action item 5)

Claim 3 was rejected under 35USC§102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,513,323.

Claim 3 has been amended to depend on claim 1. Claim 3 provides further limitations to what is believed to be an allowable claim 1, as amended and hence is also in condition for allowance.

(Detailed Action item 6)

Claims 1-55 were rejected under 35USC§103(a) as being unpatentable over IEEE Article WiSE Design of Indoor Wireless System by S.J.Fortune et al (Fortune) in view of article “Rendering Tcl/Tk Windows as HTML” by Wilfred J. Hansen (Hansen).

Neither reference taken individually or combined teaches that which is claimed by Applicant's claims, as amended. The independent claims have been amended as discussed above. Additionally, the independent claims 1, 13, 19, 25, and 30, 32, and 49 have been amended to include at least two of: a) electrical performance modeling b) cost determination, c) record maintenance, d) analysis, measurement, or simulation; e) interconnection verification, and f) visualization. Neither Wise nor Hansen provides a combination of such capabilities.

The Hansen reference focuses an *application program interface (API)*. API is a set of routines, protocols, and tools for building software applications. A good API makes it easier for a programmer to develop a program. Applicant is not developing a software program. Applicant is providing a parts list library and components with which to perform network analysis or provide a network analysis system.

Accordingly, the rejection of independent claims 1, 13, 18, 25, 30, 32 and 49 is

overcome. The dependent claims provide further limitations to what are believed to be allowable claims and hence are also in condition for allowance.

(Detailed Action item 7) and (Detailed Action item 8)

Applicant agrees with the Examiner that the list of non-patent literature is voluminous. Applicant agrees that the NPL list be placed in the file but not be considered by the Examiner. Per the Examiner's request, Applicant has provided a summary of each of the non-patent literature publications which caused it to be listed. If, based on the summary, there are any references that the Examiner would like to see, Applicant will make every effort to supply a legible copy. Applicant apologizes for the inconvenience.

No amendment made is related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment is made for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant had argued herein that such amendment is made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references. Any remarks made herein with respect to a given claim or amendment is intended only in the context of that specific claim or amendment, and should not be applied to other claims, amendments, or aspects of Applicant's invention.

Applicant has reviewed the other references of record and believes that Applicant's claimed invention is patentably distinct and nonobvious over each reference taken alone or in combination. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicant. Should the Examiner have any questions, comments, or suggestions, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney or agent at the telephone number indicated below.

Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

August 9, 2007

Motorola, Inc.
8000 West Sunrise Boulevard
Law Department – MD1610
Plantation, Florida 33322
Customer Number: 24273

By: /Barbara R. Doutre/

Barbara R. Doutre
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 39,505
Tel.: 954-723-6449
Fax: 954-723-3871
E-Mail: docketing.florida@motorola.com